

**REMARKS**

Claims 1–6 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 6 are amended.

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that the Office Action indicates that claim 6 contains allowable subject matter. Applicant has amended claim 6 to conform to U.S. Practice to expedite prosecution of the above-identified application. It is respectfully submitted that the claim is not narrowed by the amendment.

**I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 2,109,092 to Roll in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,312,566 to Carroll et al. (Carroll), and claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Roll and Carroll, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,126,085 to Wanzenbock. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The applied references do not disclose a static air freshener including a “slot being oriented in said boundary to face toward said void,” as recited in claim 1. Support for the features added to claim 1 can be found in paragraph [016] and FIGS. 1 and 3.

Instead, the slot identified in Figure 4 of Roll, attached to the Office Action dated January 31, 2006, is positioned between a cavity 12 and apertures 14 and 16. The other applied references do not make-up for the deficiencies of Roll. Therefore, the applied references fail to teach or suggest each feature of claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn because the applied references does not teach or suggest each feature of the claims.

MPEP §2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).”

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is patentable over the applied references. The remainder of the claims that depend from independent claim 1 are likewise patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional combination of features they recite.

## **II. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Any fees incident to this Amendment may be charged to Deposit Account No. 08-2665.

DATED this 21<sup>st</sup> day of April, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffery M. Lillywhite  
Registration No. 53,220  
Holme Roberts & Owen LLP  
Customer No. 34013  
299 South Main, Suite 1800  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  
(801) 521-5800